arXiv:1506.02156v1 [math.AP] 6 Jun 2015

On Local Strong Solutions to the Cauchy Problem of Two-Dimensional Density-Dependent Magnetohydrodynamic Equations with Vacuum *

Boqiang Lü[†] Zhonghai Xu[‡] Xin Zhong[§]

Abstract

This paper concerns the Cauchy problem of the nonhomogeneous incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations on the whole two-dimensional (2D) space with vacuum as far field density. In particular, the initial density can have compact support. We prove that the 2D Cauchy problem of the nonhomogeneous incompressible MHD equations admits a unique local strong solution provided the initial density and the initial magnetic decay not too slow at infinity.

Keywords: nonhomogeneous incompressible MHD equations; vacuum; strong solutions; Cauchy problem.

Math Subject Classification: 35Q35; 76D03; 76W05.

1 Introduction and main results

We consider the two-dimensional nonhomogeneous incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations which read as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla P = \mu \Delta u + H \cdot \nabla H - \frac{1}{2} \nabla |H|^2, \\ H_t - \nu \Delta H + u \cdot \nabla H - H \cdot \nabla u = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} u = \operatorname{div} H = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $t \geq 0$ is time, $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is the spatial coordinate, and $\rho = \rho(x,t)$, $u = (u^1, u^2)(x,t)$, $H = (H^1, H^2)(x,t)$, and $P = P(x,t)$ denote the density, velocity, magnetic, and pressure of the fluid, respectively; $\mu > 0$ stands for the viscosity constant. The constant $\nu > 0$ is the resistivity coefficient which is inversely proportional to the electrical conductivity constant and acts as the magnetic diffusivity of magnetic fields.

Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ and we consider the Cauchy problem for (1.1) with (ρ, u, H) vanishing at infinity (in some weak sense) and the initial conditions:

$$\rho(x,0) = \rho_0(x), \quad \rho u(x,0) = \rho_0 u_0(x), \quad H(x,0) = H_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

---

*B. Lü is supported by NNSFC Tianyuan (No. 11426131) and Natural Science Foundation of Jiangxi Province (No. 20142BAB211006).

[†] College of Mathematics and Information Science, Nanchang Hangkong University, Nanchang 330063, P. R. China(`lvbq86@163.com`).

[‡] College of Science, Northeast Dianli University, Jilin 132013, P. R. China (`xuzhonghai@163.com`).

[§] Corresponding author. Institute of Applied Mathematics, AMSS, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China(`xzhong1014@amss.ac.cn`).

for given initial data ρ_0, u_0 and H_0.

Magnetohydrodynamics studies the dynamics of electrically conducting fluids and the theory of the macroscopic interaction of electrically conducting fluids with a magnetic field. In particular, if there is no electromagnetic effect, that is $H = 0$, the MHD system reduces to the Navier-Stokes equations, which have been discussed by many mathematicians, please see [4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15–24] and references therein. Since the fluid motion and the magnetic field are strongly couplied and interplay interaction with each other, it is rather complicated to investigate the MHD system. Now, we briefly recall some results concerning with the multi-dimensional nonhomogeneous incompressible MHD equations which are more relatively to our problem. Gerbeau-Le Bris [11] and Desjardins-Le Bris [9] studied the global existence of weak solutions with finite energy on 3D bounded domains and on the torus, respectively. In the absence of vacuum, Abidi-Hmidi [1] and Abidi-Paicu [2] established the local and global (with small initial data) existence of strong solutions in some Besov spaces, respectively. In the presence of vacuum, under the following compatibility conditions,

$$\mathrm{div} u_0 = \mathrm{div} H_0 = 0, \quad -\Delta u_0 + \nabla P_0 - (H_0 \cdot \nabla) H_0 = \rho_0^{1/2} g, \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

where $(P_0,\ g) \in H^1 \times L^2$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, Chen-Tan-Wang [6] obtained the local existence of strong solutions to the 3D Cauchy problem, and proved the local solution is global provided the initial data satisfy some smallness conditions. When $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain, Huang-Wang [14] investigated the global existence of strong solution with general large data when the initial density contains vacuum states and the initial data satisfy the compatibility conditions (1.3).

Recently, Li-Liang [20] established the local existence of strong solutions to the 2D Cauchy problem of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^2$ with vacuum as far field density. Later, Lü-Huang [25] obtained the local strong solutions to 2D Cauchy problem of the compressible MHD equations, which generalized the results of [20] to the MHD system. Motivated by [20], Liang [22] proved the local existence of strong solutions to 2D Cauchy problem of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, that is (1.1)-(1.2) with $H = 0$. However, for the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(1.2) with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$, it is still open even for the local existence of strong solutions when the far field density is vacuum, in particular, the initial density may have compact support. In fact, this is the main aim in this paper.

Now, we wish to define precisely what we mean by strong solutions.

Definition 1.1 *If all derivatives involved in* (1.1) *for* (ρ, u, P, H) *are regular distributions, and equations* (1.1) *hold almost everywhere in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)$*, then* (ρ, u, P, H) *is called a strong solution to* (1.1)*.*

In this section, for $1 \le r \le \infty$ and $k \ge 1$, we denote the standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces as follows:

$$L^r = L^r(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad W^{k,r} = W^{k,r}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad H^k = W^{k,2}.$$

Theorem 1.1 *Let* η_0 *be a positive constant and*

$$\bar{x} \triangleq (e + |x|^2)^{1/2} \log^{1+\eta_0}(e + |x|^2). \tag{1.4}$$

For constants $q > 2$ *and* $a > 1$*, assume that the initial data* (ρ_0, u_0, H_0) *satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \rho_0 \ge 0, \ \rho_0 \bar{x}^a \in L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}, \ H_0 \bar{x}^{a/2} \in L^2, \\ \sqrt{\rho_0} u_0 \in L^2, \ \nabla u_0 \in L^2, \ \nabla H_0 \in L^2, \ \mathrm{div} u_0 = \mathrm{div} H_0 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Then there exists a positive time $T_0 > 0$ *such that the problem* (1.1)-(1.2) *has a unique strong solution* (ρ, u, P, H) *on* $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T_0]$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \rho \in C([0,T_0]; L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}), \\ \rho \bar{x}^a \in L^\infty(0,T_0; L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}), \\ \sqrt{\rho} u,\ \nabla u,\ \bar{x}^{-1} u,\ \sqrt{t}\sqrt{\rho} u_t,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla P,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla^2 u \in L^\infty(0,T_0; L^2), \\ H, H\bar{x}^{a/2}, \nabla H, \sqrt{t} H_t,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla^2 H \in L^\infty(0,T_0; L^2), \\ \nabla u \in L^2(0,T_0; H^1) \cap L^{(q+1)/q}(0,T_0; W^{1,q}), \\ \nabla P \in L^2(0,T_0; L^2) \cap L^{(q+1)/q}(0,T_0; L^q), \\ \nabla H \in L^2(0,T_0; H^1),\ H_t,\ \nabla H \bar{x}^{a/2} \in L^2(0,T_0; L^2), \\ \sqrt{t}\nabla u \in L^2(0,T_0; W^{1,q}), \\ \sqrt{\rho} u_t,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla H \bar{x}^{a/2},\ \sqrt{t}\nabla u_t,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla H_t,\ \sqrt{t}\bar{x}^{-1} u_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T_0)), \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$\inf_{0 \le t \le T_0} \int_{B_N} \rho(x,t)dx \ge \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0(x)dx, \tag{1.7}$$

for some constant $N > 0$ *and* $B_N \triangleq \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \middle| \ |x| < N \right\}$.

Remark 1.1 *Compared with [6] and [8], there is no need to impose the additional compatibility conditions of the initial data for the local existence of strong solutions.*

If $H \equiv H_0 \equiv 0$, Theorem 1.1 directly yields the following local existence theorem for the density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations.

Theorem 1.2 *Let* η_0 *and* $\bar{x}$ *be as in* (1.4). *For constants* $q > 2$ *and* $a > 1$, *assume that the initial data* (ρ_0, u_0) *satisfy*

$$\rho_0 \ge 0,\ \rho_0 \bar{x}^a \in L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q},\ \sqrt{\rho_0} u_0 \in L^2,\ \nabla u_0 \in L^2,\ \mathrm{div} u_0 = 0.$$

Then there exists a positive time $T_0 > 0$ *such that the 2D Cauchy problem of the density-dependent Navier-Stokes equations, thai is* (1.1)-(1.2) *with* $H = 0$, *has a unique strong solution* (ρ, u, P) *on* $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T_0]$ *satisfying* (1.6) *where* $H = 0$, *and* (1.7).

Remark 1.2 *Our Theorem 1.2 holds for arbitrary* $a > 1$ *which is in sharp contrast to Liang [22] where* $a \in (1, 2)$ *is required.*

We now make some comments on the key ingredients of the analysis in this paper. It should be pointed out that, for the whole two-dimensional space, it seems difficult to bound the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$-norm of u just in terms of $\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ and $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}$. Furthermore, as mentioned in many papers (see [14, 25, 26] for example), the strong coupling between the velocity field and the magnetic field, such as $\||u||H|\|$ and $\||u||\nabla H|\|$, will bring out some new difficulties. In order to overcome these difficulties stated above, we will use some key ideas due to [20, 25] where they deal with the 2D compressible Navier-Stokes and MHD equations, respectively. On the one hand, motivated by [20], it is enough to bound the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$-norm of the momentum ρu instead of just the velocity u. More precisely, using a Hardy-type inequality (see (3.11)) which is originally due to Lions [23], together with some careful analysis on the spatial weighted estimate of the density (see (3.13)), we can obtain the desired estimates on the $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$-norm of ρu (see (3.20)). On the other hand, inspired by [25], we deduce some spatial weighted estimates on both H and ∇H (i.e., $\bar{x}^{a/2}H$ and $\bar{x}^{a/2}\nabla H$, see (3.16) and (3.51)) which are crucial to control the coupled terms, such as $\||u||H|\|$ and $\||u||\nabla H|\|$. Next, we then construct approximate solutions to (1.1), that is, for density strictly away from vacuum initially, consider a initial boundary value problem of (1.1) in any bounded ball B_R with radius $R > 0$. Finally, combining all key points mentioned above with the similar arguments as in [7, 20, 25], we derive some desired bounds on the gradients of both the solutions and the spatial weighted density, which are independent of both the radius of the balls B_R and the lower bound of the initial density.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we collect some elementary facts and inequalities which will be needed in later analysis. Sections 3 is devoted to the a priori estimates which are needed to obtain the local existence and uniqueness of strong solutions. The main result Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we will recall some known facts and elementary inequalities which will be used frequently later. First of all, if the initial density is strictly away from vacuum, the following local existence theorem on bounded balls can be shown by similar arguments as in [6, 8, 14].

Lemma 2.1 *For $R > 0$ and $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 | |x| < R\}$, assume that (ρ_0, u_0, H_0) satisfies*

$$(\rho_0, u_0, H_0) \in H^2(B_R), \quad \inf_{x \in B_R} \rho_0(x) > 0, \quad \mathrm{div} u_0 = \mathrm{div} H_0 = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Then there exist a small time $T_R > 0$ such that the equations (1.1) with the following initial-boundary-value conditions

$$\begin{cases} (\rho, u, H)(x, t = 0) = (\rho_0, u_0, H_0), & x \in B_R, \\ u(x, t) = 0, \ H(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial B_R, \ t > 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

has a unique classical solution (ρ, u, P, H) on $B_R \times (0, T_R]$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \rho \in C\left([0, T_R]; H^2\right), \\ (u, H) \in C\left([0, T_R]; H^2\right) \cap L^2\left(0, T_R; H^3\right), \\ P \in C\left([0, T_R]; H^1\right) \cap L^2\left(0, T_R; H^2\right), \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where we denote $H^k = H^k(B_R)$ for positive integer k.

Next, for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the following weighted L^m-bounds for elements of the Hilbert space $\tilde{D}^{1,2}(\Omega) \triangleq \{v \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) | \nabla v \in L^2(\Omega)\}$ can be found in [23, Theorem B.1].

Lemma 2.2 *For $m \in [2, \infty)$ and $\theta \in (1 + m/2, \infty)$, there exists a positive constant C such that for either $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$ or $\Omega = B_R$ with $R \geq 1$ and for any $v \in \tilde{D}^{1,2}(\Omega)$,*

$$\left(\int_\Omega \frac{|v|^m}{e + |x|^2} (\log(e + |x|^2))^{-\theta} dx \right)^{1/m} \leq C\|v\|_{L^2(B_1)} + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{2.4}$$

A useful consequence of Lemma 2.2 is the following crucial weighted bounds for elements of $\tilde{D}^{1,2}(\Omega)$, which have been proved in [20, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 2.3 *Let $\bar{x}$ and η_0 be as in (1.4) and Ω be as in Lemma 2.2. Assume that $\rho \in L^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ is a non-negative function such that*

$$\int_{B_{N_1}} \rho dx \geq M_1, \quad \|\rho\|_{L^1(\Omega)\cap L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_2, \tag{2.5}$$

for positive constants M_1, M_2, and $N_1 \geq 1$ with $B_{N_1} \subset \Omega$. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, there is a positive constant C depending only on $\varepsilon, \eta, M_1, M_2, N_1$, and η_0 such that every $v \in \tilde{D}^{1,2}(\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\|v\bar{x}^{-\eta}\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\tilde{\eta}}(\Omega)} \leq C\|\rho^{1/2}v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{2.6}$$

with $\tilde{\eta} = \min\{1, \eta\}$.

Finally, the following L^p-bound for elliptic systems, whose proof is similar to that of [7, Lemma 12], is a direct result of the combination of the well-known elliptic theory [3] and a standard scaling procedure.

Lemma 2.4 *For $p > 1$ and $k \geq 0$, there exists a positive constant C depending only on p and k such that*

$$\|\nabla^{k+2}v\|_{L^p(B_R)} \leq C\|\Delta v\|_{W^{k,p}(B_R)}, \tag{2.7}$$

for every $v \in W^{k+2,p}(B_R)$ satisfying

$$v = 0 \quad on \quad B_R.$$

3 A priori estimates

In this section, for $r \in [1, \infty]$ and $k \geq 0$, we denote

$$\int \cdot dx = \int_{B_R} \cdot dx, \quad L^r = L^r(B_R), \quad W^{k,r} = W^{k,r}(B_R), \quad H^k = W^{k,2}.$$

Moreover, for $R > 4N_0 \geq 4$, assume that (ρ_0, u_0, H_0) satisfies, in addition to (2.1), that

$$1/2 \leq \int_{B_{N_0}} \rho_0(x)dx \leq \int_{B_R} \rho_0(x)dx \leq 3/2. \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 2.1 thus yields that there exists some $T_R > 0$ such that the initial-boundary-value problem (1.1) and (2.2) has a unique classical solution (ρ, u, P, H) on $B_R \times [0, T_R]$ satisfying (2.3).

Let $\bar{x}, \eta_0, a$, and q be as in Theorem 1.1, the main aim of this section is to derive the following key a priori estimate on ψ defined by

$$\psi(t) \triangleq 1 + \|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla H\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{x}^{a/2}H\|_{L^2} + \|\bar{x}^a\rho\|_{L^1\cap H^1\cap W^{1,q}}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.1 *Assume that (ρ_0, u_0, H_0) satisfies (2.1) and (3.1). Let (ρ, u, P, H) be the solution to the initial-boundary-value problem (1.1) and (2.2) on $B_R \times (0, T_R]$ obtained by*

Lemma 2.1. Then there exist positive constants T_0 and M both depending only on μ, ν, q, a, η_0, N_0, and E_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}\Big(\psi(t)+\sqrt{t}\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}+\sqrt{t}\|H_t\|_{L^2}+\sqrt{t}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}+\sqrt{t}\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}+\sqrt{t}\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}\Big)\\
&+\int_0^{T_0}\Big(\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2+\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\Big)\,dt\\
&+\int_0^{T_0}\Big(\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}+\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}+t\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^2+t\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^2\Big)\\
&+\int_0^{T_0}\big(t\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+t\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2\big)\,dt\le M,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.3}$$

where

$$E_0\triangleq\|\rho_0^{1/2}u_0\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla H_0\|_{L^2}+\|\bar{x}^a\rho_0\|_{L^1\cap H^1\cap W^{1,q}}+\|\bar{x}^{a/2}H_0\|_{L^2}.$$

To show Proposition 3.1, whose proof will be postponed to the end of this section, we begin with the following standard energy estimate for (ρ,u,P,H) and the estimate on the L^p-norm of the density.

Lemma 3.2 *Under the conditions of Proposition 3.1, let (ρ,u,P,H) be a smooth solution to the initial-boundary-value problem* (1.1) *and* (2.2). *Then for any $t>0$,*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\Big(\|\rho\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}+\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^2+\|H\|_{L^2}^2\Big)+\int_0^t\big(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\big)\,ds\le C,\tag{3.4}$$

where (and in what follows) C denotes a generic positive constant depending only on μ,ν,q,a, η_0, N_0, and E_0.

Proof. First, applying standard energy estimate to (1.1) gives

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\Big(\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}^2+\|H\|_{L^2}^2\Big)+\int_0^t\big(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\big)\,ds\le C.\tag{3.5}$$

Next, since $\mathrm{div}u=0$, it is easy to deduce from $(1.1)_1$ that (see [23]),

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\|\rho\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty}\le C.\tag{3.6}$$

This together with (3.5) yields (3.4) and completes the proof of Lemma 3.2. □

Next, we will give some spatial weighted estimates on the density and the magnetic.

Lemma 3.3 *Under the conditions of Proposition 3.1, let (ρ,u,P,H) be a smooth solution to the initial-boundary-value problem* (1.1) *and* (2.2). *Then there exists a $T_1=T_1(N_0,E_0)>0$ such that for all $t\in(0,T_1]$,*

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\Big(\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}+\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\Big)+\int_0^t\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2ds\le C.\tag{3.7}$$

Proof. First, for $N>1$, let $\varphi_N\in C_0^\infty(B_N)$ satisfy

$$0\le\varphi_N\le 1,\quad \varphi_N(x)=1,\ \text{if } |x|\le N/2,\quad |\nabla\varphi_N|\le CN^{-1}.\tag{3.8}$$

It follows from $(1.1)_1$ and (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho\varphi_{2N_0}dx &= \int \rho u\cdot\nabla\varphi_{2N_0}dx \\ &\ge -CN_0^{-1}\left(\int \rho dx\right)^{1/2}\left(\int \rho|u|^2dx\right)^{1/2} \ge -\tilde{C}(E_0).\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

Integrating (3.9) and using (3.1) give

$$\inf_{0\le t\le T_1}\int_{B_{2N_0}}\rho dx \ge \inf_{0\le t\le T_1}\int \rho\varphi_{2N_0}dx \ge \int \rho_0\varphi_{2N_0}dx - \tilde{C}T_1 \ge 1/4.\tag{3.10}$$

Here, $T_1 \triangleq \min\{1,(4\tilde{C})^{-1}\}$. From now on, we will always assume that $t \le T_1$. The combination of (3.10), (3.4), and (2.6) implies that for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, every $v \in \tilde{D}^{1,2}(B_R)$ satisfies

$$\|v\bar{x}^{-\eta}\|^2_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\tilde{\eta}}} \le C(\varepsilon,\eta)\|\rho^{1/2}v\|_{L^2} + C(\varepsilon,\eta)\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^2},\tag{3.11}$$

with $\tilde{\eta} = \min\{1,\eta\}$.

Next, multiplying $(1.1)_1$ by $\bar{x}^a$ and integrating by parts imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1} &\le C\int \rho|u|\bar{x}^{a-1}\log^{1+\eta_0}(e+|x|^2)dx \\ &\le C\|\rho\bar{x}^{a-1+\frac{8}{8+a}}\|_{L^{\frac{8+a}{7+a}}}\|u\bar{x}^{-\frac{4}{8+a}}\|_{L^{8+a}} \\ &\le C\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{1}{8+a}}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}^{\frac{7+a}{8+a}}\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\le C\left(1+\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}\right)\left(1+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}\right)\end{aligned}\tag{3.12}$$

due to (3.4) and (3.11). This combined with Gronwall's inequality and (3.4) leads to

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1} \le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\left(1+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}\right)ds\right\} \le C.\tag{3.13}$$

Now, multiplying $(1.1)_3$ by $H\bar{x}^a$ and integrating by parts yield

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2} + \nu\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2} \\ &= \frac{\nu}{2}\int |H|^2\Delta\bar{x}^a dx + \int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot H\bar{x}^a dx + \frac{1}{2}\int |H|^2 u\cdot\nabla\bar{x}^a dx \\ &\triangleq \bar{I}_1 + \bar{I}_2 + \bar{I}_3,\end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}|\bar{I}_1| &\le C\int |H|^2\bar{x}^a\bar{x}^{-2}\log^{2(1-\eta_0)}(e+|x|^2)dx \le C\int |H|^2\bar{x}^a dx, \\ |\bar{I}_2| &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^4} \\ &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}(\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2} + \|H\nabla\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}) \\ &\le C(\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}+1)\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2}, \\ |\bar{I}_3| &\le C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^4}\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\|u\bar{x}^{-3/4}\|_{L^4} \\ &\le C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^4} + C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2}\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u\|^2_{L^2}+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}\right) \\ &\le C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}\right)\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|^2_{L^2},\end{aligned}\tag{3.15}$$

due to Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (see [27]), (3.4), and (3.11). Putting (3.15) into (3.14), we get after using Gronwall's inequality and (3.4) that

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2ds\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\right\}\le C, \tag{3.16}$$

which together with (3.13) gives (3.7) and finishes the proof of Lemma 3.3. □

Lemma 3.4 *Let (ρ,u,P,H) and T_1 be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a positive constant $\alpha>1$ such that for all $t\in(0,T_1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\&\quad+\int_0^t\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_s\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+\|H_s\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\le C+C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha(s)ds.\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. Multiplying $(1.1)_2$ by u_t and integrating by parts, one has

$$\mu\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla u|^2dx+\int\rho|u_t|^2dx\le C\int\rho|u|^2|\nabla u|^2dx+\int H\cdot\nabla H\cdot u_tdx. \tag{3.18}$$

First, it follows from (3.4), (3.7), and (3.11) that for any $\varepsilon>0$ and any $\eta>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\rho^\eta v\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\tilde\eta}}&\le C\|\rho^\eta\bar{x}^{\frac{3\tilde\eta a}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\|_{L^{\frac{4(2+\varepsilon)}{3\tilde\eta}}}\|v\bar{x}^{-\frac{3\tilde\eta a}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\|_{L^{\frac{4(2+\varepsilon)}{\tilde\eta}}}\\&\le C\left(\int\rho^{\frac{4(2+\varepsilon)\eta}{3\tilde\eta}-1}\rho\bar{x}^adx\right)^{\frac{3\tilde\eta}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\|v\bar{x}^{-\frac{3\tilde\eta a}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\|_{L^{\frac{4(2+\varepsilon)}{\tilde\eta}}}\\&\le C\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{4(2+\varepsilon)\eta-3\tilde\eta}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}^{\frac{3\tilde\eta}{4(2+\varepsilon)}}\left(\|\rho^{1/2}v\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\right)\\&\le C\|\rho^{1/2}v\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $\tilde\eta=\min\{1,\eta\}$ and $v\in\tilde{D}^{1,2}(B_R)$. In particular, this together with (3.4) and (3.11) derives

$$\|\rho^\eta u\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\tilde\eta}}+\|u\bar{x}^{-\eta}\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\tilde\eta}}\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}), \tag{3.20}$$

which combined with Hölder's and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int\rho|u|^2|\nabla u|^2dx&\le C\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^8}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^{8/3}}^2\\&\le C\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^8}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{3/2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}^{1/2}\\&\le C\psi^\alpha+\varepsilon\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where (and in what follows) we use $\alpha>1$ to denote a genetic constant, which may be different from line to line.

For the second term on the right-hand side of (3.18), integration by parts together with $(1.1)_4$ and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality deduces that

$$\begin{aligned}\int H\cdot\nabla H\cdot u_tdx&=-\frac{d}{dt}\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx+\int H_t\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx+\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot H_tdx\\&\le-\frac{d}{dt}\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|H\|_{L^4}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2\\&\le-\frac{d}{dt}\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}\\&\le-\frac{d}{dt}\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\varepsilon\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha.\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Inserting (3.21)–(3.22) into (3.18) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}B(t)+\int\rho|u_t|^2dx\le\varepsilon\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha,\tag{3.23}$$

where

$$B(t)\triangleq\mu\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\int H\cdot\nabla u\cdot Hdx$$

satisfies

$$\frac{\mu}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2-C_1\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\le B(t)\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2.\tag{3.24}$$

Moreover, it follows from $(1.1)_3$ that

$$\begin{aligned}&\nu\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2+\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\nu^2\|\Delta H\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\||H||\nabla u|\|_{L^2}^2+C\||u||\nabla H|\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\bar{x}^{-a/4}u\|_{L^8}^2\|\bar{x}^{a/2}\nabla H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla H\|_{L^4}\\&\le\frac{\nu^2}{2}\|\Delta H\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha+C\|\bar{x}^{a/2}\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\end{aligned}\tag{3.25}$$

due to (2.7), (3.20), and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality. Multiplying (3.25) by $\nu^{-1}(C_1+1)$ and adding the resulting inequality to (3.23) imply

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(B(t)+(C_1+1)\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{2}\|\Delta H\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\psi^\alpha+C\|\bar{x}^{a/2}\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2+\varepsilon\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.26}$$

On the other hand, since (ρ,u,P,H) satisfies the following Stokes system

$$\begin{cases}-\mu\Delta u+\nabla P=-\rho u_t-\rho u\cdot\nabla u+H\cdot\nabla H-\frac{1}{2}\nabla|H|^2, & x\in B_R,\\ \mathrm{div}u=0, & x\in B_R,\\ u(x)=0, & x\in\partial B_R,\end{cases}\tag{3.27}$$

applying the standard L^p-estimate to (3.27) (see [28]) yields that for any $p\in(1,\infty)$,

$$\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^p}+\|\nabla P\|_{L^p}\le C\|\rho u_t\|_{L^p}+C\|\rho u\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^p}+C\||H||\nabla H|\|_{L^p}.\tag{3.28}$$

Then, it follows from (3.28), (3.4), (3.20), and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|\rho u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\rho u\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+C\||H||\nabla H|\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\rho u\|_{L^4}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2+C\|H\|_{L^4}^2\|\nabla H\|_{L^4}^2\\&\le C\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\rho u\|_{L^4}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}+C\|H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla H\|_{H^1}\\&\le C\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{4}\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+C\left(1+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^4+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^6\right)\\&\le C\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{4}\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha.\end{aligned}\tag{3.29}$$

Finally, substituting (3.29) into (3.26) and choosing ε suitably small, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(B(t)+(C_1+1)\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\frac{1}{2}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu^{-1}}{2}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{4}\|\Delta H\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\psi^\alpha+C\|\bar{x}^{a/2}\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{3.30}$$

Integrating the above inequality over $(0,t)$, it follows from (2.7), (3.24), (3.7), and (3.29) that (3.17) holds. The proof of Lemma 3.4 is finished. □

Lemma 3.5 *Let (ρ, u, P, H) and T_1 be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a positive constant $\alpha > 1$ such that for all $t \in (0, T_1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(s\|\rho^{1/2}u_s\|_{L^2}^2 + s\|H_s\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \int_0^t \left(s\|\nabla u_s\|_{L^2}^2 + s\|\nabla H_s\|_{L^2}^2\right) ds \\
&\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha ds\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Proof. Differentiating $(1.1)_2$ with respect to t gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho u_{tt} + \rho u\cdot\nabla u_t - \mu\Delta u_t \\
&= -\rho_t(u_t + u\cdot\nabla u) - \rho u_t\cdot\nabla u - \nabla P_t + \left(H\cdot\nabla H - \frac{1}{2}\nabla|H|^2\right)_t .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Multiplying (3.32) by u_t and integrating the resulting equality by parts over B_R, we obtain after using $(1.1)_1$ and $(1.1)_4$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho|u_t|^2dx + \mu\int|\nabla u_t|^2dx \\
&\le C\int \rho|u||u_t|\left(|\nabla u_t| + |\nabla u|^2 + |u||\nabla^2u|\right)dx + C\int\rho|u|^2|\nabla u||\nabla u_t|dx \\
&\quad + C\int\rho|u_t|^2|\nabla u|dx + \int H_t\cdot\nabla H\cdot u_tdx + \int H\cdot\nabla H_t\cdot u_tdx \\
&\triangleq \sum_{i=1}^5 \hat{I}_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

We estimate each term on the right-hand side of (3.33) as follows.

First, it follows from (3.19), (3.20), and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_1 &\le C\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^6}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^6}^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2\right) \\
&\quad + C\|\rho^{1/4}u\|_{L^{12}}^2\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^6}^{1/2}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2} \\
&\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \cdot\left(\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}\right) \\
&\le \frac{\mu}{6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\psi^\alpha\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\psi^\alpha + C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\right)\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Then, Hölder's inequality combined with (3.19) and (3.20) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_2 + \hat{I}_3 &\le C\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^8}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^6}^{3/2}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
&\le \frac{\mu}{6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\psi^\alpha\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(\psi^\alpha + \|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Next, integration by parts together with $(1.1)_4$, Hölder's and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities indicates that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I}_4 + \hat{I}_5 &= -\int H_t\cdot\nabla u_t\cdot Hdx - \int H\cdot\nabla u_t\cdot H_tdx \\
&\le \frac{\mu}{6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|H\|_{L^4}^2\|H_t\|_{L^4}^2 \\
&\le \frac{\mu}{6}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\mu\nu}{4(C_2+1)}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\psi^\alpha\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where the constant C_2 is defined in the following (3.44).

Substituting (3.34)–(3.36) into (3.33), we obtain after using (3.29) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\mu\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\le C\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)&\\ +\frac{\mu\nu}{2(C_2+1)}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\right)\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2.&\end{aligned}\tag{3.37}$$

Differentiating $(1.1)_3$ with respect to t shows

$$H_{tt}-H_t\cdot\nabla u-H\cdot\nabla u_t+u_t\cdot\nabla H+u\cdot\nabla H_t=\nu\Delta H_t.\tag{3.38}$$

Multiplying (3.38) by H_t and integrating the resulting equality over B_R yield that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|H_t|^2dx+\nu\int|\nabla H_t|^2dx\\ &=\int H\cdot\nabla u_t\cdot H_tdx-\int u_t\cdot\nabla H\cdot H_tdx+\int H_t\cdot\nabla u\cdot H_tdx-\int u\cdot\nabla H_t\cdot H_tdx\\ &\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^4S_i.\end{aligned}\tag{3.39}$$

On the one hand, we deduce from (3.11) and (3.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^2S_i&\le C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\|H_t\|_{L^4}\|H\|_{L^4}+C\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}\||u_t||H|\|_{L^2}\\ &\le C\|H_t\|_{L^4}^2+C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{8}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\||u_t||H|\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\le\frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|u_t\bar{x}^{-a/4}\|_{L^8}^2\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\|H\|_{L^4}\\ &\le\frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{3.40}$$

where one has used the following estimate

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\||H|^2\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^t\||\nabla H||H|\|_{L^2}^2ds\le C.\tag{3.41}$$

Indeed, multiplying $(1.1)_3$ by $H|H|^2$ and integrating by parts lead to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{4}\left(\||H|^2\|_{L^2}^2\right)_t+\nu\||\nabla H||H|\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla|H|^2\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\||H|^2\|_{L^4}^2\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\||H|^2\|_{L^2}\|\nabla|H|^2\|_{L^2}\\ &\le\frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla|H|^2\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\||H|^2\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{3.42}$$

which together with Gronwall's inequality and (3.4) gives (3.41).

On the other hand, integration by parts combined with $(1.1)_4$ and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality yields

$$\sum_{i=3}^4S_i=\int H_t\cdot\nabla u\cdot H_tdx\le C\|H_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\le\frac{\nu}{4}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2.\tag{3.43}$$

Inserting (3.40) and (3.43) into (3.39), one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\nu\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2\le C\psi^\alpha\left(\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)+C_2\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{3.44}$$

Finally, multiplying (3.37) by $\mu^{-1}(C_2+1)$ and adding the resulting inequality to (3.44), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mu^{-1}(C_2+1)\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla H_t\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)+C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\right)\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Multiplying (3.45) by t, we obtain (3.31) after using Gronwall's inequality and (3.17). The proof of Lemma 3.5 is finished. □

Lemma 3.6 *Let (ρ,u,P,H) and T_1 be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a positive constant $\alpha>1$ such that for all $t\in(0,T_1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(s\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+s\|\nabla^2H\|_{L^2}^2+s\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\int_0^t s\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2ds\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

Proof. First, multiplying $(1.1)_3$ by $\Delta H\bar{x}^a$ and integrating by parts lead to

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla H|^2\bar{x}^adx+\nu\int|\Delta H|^2\bar{x}^adx\\\le&C\int|\nabla H||H||\nabla u||\nabla\bar{x}^a|dx+C\int|\nabla H|^2|u||\nabla\bar{x}^a|dx+C\int|\nabla H||\Delta H||\nabla\bar{x}^a|dx\\&+C\int|H||\nabla u||\Delta H|\bar{x}^adx+C\int|\nabla u||\nabla H|^2\bar{x}^adx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^5J_i.\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Using (3.16), (3.11), Hölder's and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, one gets by some direct calculations that

$$\begin{aligned}J_1\le&C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^4}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\\\le&C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\left(\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}+\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\right)^{1/2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}^{1/2}\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\\\le&C\psi^\alpha+C\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2,\\J_2\le&C\||\nabla H|^{2-\frac{2}{3a}}\bar{x}^{a-\frac{1}{3}}\|_{L^{\frac{6a}{6a-2}}}\|u\bar{x}^{-\frac{1}{3}}\|_{L^{6a}}\||\nabla H|^{\frac{2}{3a}}\|_{L^{6a}}\\\le&C\psi^\alpha\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^{\frac{6a-2}{3a}}\|\nabla H\|_{L^4}^{\frac{2}{3a}}\le C\psi^\alpha\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla H\|_{L^4}^2\\\le&C\psi^\alpha\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu}{4}\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2,\\J_3+J_4\le&\frac{\nu}{4}\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^4}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2\\\le&\frac{\nu}{4}\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\\&+C\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\left(\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}+\|H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\right)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}\\\le&\varepsilon\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2+C\psi^\alpha+C\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2,\\J_5\le&C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\le C\left(\psi^\alpha+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}\right)\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

Substituting the above estimates into (3.47) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla H|^2\bar{x}^a dx + \nu\int |\Delta H|^2\bar{x}^a dx\\&\quad\le C\left(\psi^\alpha + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}\right)\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 + \psi^\alpha\right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.49}$$

Now, we claim that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t \left(\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q} + \|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q} + s\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2 + s\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^2\right) ds\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha(s)ds\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{3.50}$$

whose proof will be given at the end of this proof. Thus, multiplying (3.49) by t, we infer from (3.16), (3.17), (3.50), and Gronwall's inequality that

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(s\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \int_0^t s\|\Delta H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2 ds \le C\exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\}.\tag{3.51}$$

Next, it is easy to deduce from $(1.1)_3$, (2.7), (3.5), (3.20), Hölder's and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2 &\le C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\||u||\nabla H|\|_{L^2}^2 + C\||H||\nabla u|\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\bar{x}^{-a/4}\|_{L^8}^2\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla H\|_{L^4} + C\|H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\bar{x}^{-a/4}\|_{L^8}^4\|\nabla H\|_{L^4}^2 + C\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\|H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4}\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2 + C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^8\right)\left(1+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^2\right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.52}$$

which together with (3.29) gives that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla P\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le C\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|H_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\right) + C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^8\right)\left(1+\|\nabla H\|_{L^2}^4\right).\end{aligned}\tag{3.53}$$

Then, multiplying (3.53) by s, one gets from (3.17), (3.31), and (3.51) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(s\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^2 + s\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}^2 + s\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\} + C\left(1+\int_0^t \psi^\alpha(s)ds\right)^{12}\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{3.54}$$

which combined with (3.51) implies (3.46).

Finally, to finish the proof of Lemma 3.6, it suffices to show (3.50). Indeed, choosing $p = q$

in (3.28), we deduce from (3.4), (3.19), and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}&\le C\left(\|\rho u_t\|_{L^q}+\|\rho u\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^q}+\||H||\nabla H|\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\le C\left(\|\rho u_t\|_{L^q}+\|\rho u\|_{L^{2q}}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2q}}+\|H\|_{L^{2q}}\|\nabla H\|_{L^{2q}}\right)\\&\le C\|\rho u_t\|_{L^2}^{2(q-1)/(q^2-2)}\|\rho u_t\|_{L^{q^2}}^{(q^2-2q)/(q^2-2)}\\&\quad+C\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}\right)\\&\le C\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{2(q-1)/(q^2-2)}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^{(q^2-2q)/(q^2-2)}+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}\right)\\&\quad+C\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{3.55}$$

which together with (3.17) and (3.31) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t\left(\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}+\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}\right)ds\\&\le C\int_0^t s^{-\frac{q+1}{2q}}\left(s\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{q^2-1}{q(q^2-2)}}\left(s\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{(q-2)(q+1)}{2(q^2-2)}}ds\\&\quad+C\int_0^t\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q+1}{q}}ds+C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q^2-1}{q^2}}+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^{\frac{q^2-1}{q^2}}\right)ds\\&\le C\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left(s\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{q^2-1}{q(q^2-2)}}\int_0^t s^{-\frac{q+1}{2q}}\left(s\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{\frac{(q-2)(q+1)}{2(q^2-2)}}ds\\&\quad+C\int_0^t\left(\psi^\alpha+\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha ds\right\}\left(1+\int_0^t\left(s^{-\frac{q^3+q^2-2q-2}{q^3+q^2-2q}}+s\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\right)\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha ds\right\}\end{aligned}\tag{3.56}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^t\left(s\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2+s\|\nabla P\|_{L^q}^2\right)ds\\&\le C\int_0^t s\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2ds+C\int_0^t\left(s\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{2(q-1)/(q^2-2)}\left(s\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)^{(q^2-2q)/(q^2-2)}ds\\&\quad+C\int_0^t s\psi^\alpha\left(1+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^{1-1/q}\right)^2ds\\&\le C\int_0^t s\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2ds+C\int_0^t s\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2ds+C\int_0^t\left(\psi^\alpha+s\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2 H\|_{L^2}^2\right)ds\\&\le C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha ds\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.57}$$

One thus obtains (3.50) from (3.56)–(3.57) and finishes the proof of Lemma 3.6. □

Lemma 3.7 *Let* (ρ,u,P,H) *and* T_1 *be as in Lemma 3.3. Then there exists a positive constant* $\alpha>1$ *such that for all* $t\in(0,T_1]$,

$$\sup_{0\le s\le t}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1\cap H^1\cap W^{1,q}}\le\exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t\psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\}.\tag{3.58}$$

Proof. First, it follows from Sobolev's inequality and (3.20) that for $0 < \delta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^\infty} &\le C(\delta)\left(\|u\bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{4/\delta}} + \|\nabla(u\bar{x}^{-\delta})\|_{L^3}\right)\\ &\le C(\delta)\left(\|u\bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{4/\delta}} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^3} + \|u\bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{4/\delta}}\|\bar{x}^{-1}\nabla\bar{x}\|_{L^{12/(4-3\delta)}}\right)\\ &\le C(\delta)\left(\psi^\alpha + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

One derives from $(1.1)_1$ that $\rho\bar{x}^a$ satisfies

$$\partial_t(\rho\bar{x}^a) + u\cdot\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a) - a\rho\bar{x}^a u\cdot\nabla\log\bar{x} = 0, \tag{3.60}$$

which along with (3.59) gives that for any $r \in [2, q]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^r} \le& C\left(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\cdot\nabla\log\bar{x}\|_{L^\infty}\right)\|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^r}\\ &+ C\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^\infty}\left(\||\nabla u||\nabla\log\bar{x}|\|_{L^r} + \||u||\nabla^2\log\bar{x}|\|_{L^r}\right)\\ \le& C\left(\psi^\alpha + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2\cap L^q}\right)\|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^r}\\ &+ C\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^\infty}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^r} + \|u\bar{x}^{-\frac{2}{5}}\|_{L^{4r}}\|\bar{x}^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{4r}{3}}}\right)\\ \le& C\left(\psi^\alpha + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2\cap L^q}\right)\left(1 + \|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^r} + \|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^q}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.61}$$

where in the last inequalities one has used (3.13).

Finally, using (3.17), (3.50), (3.7), (3.61), and Gronwall's inequality, one thus gets (3.58) and completes the proof of Lemma 3.7. □

Now, Proposition 3.1 is a direct consequence of Lemmas 3.2–3.7.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. It follows from (3.4), (3.7), (3.17), and (3.58) that

$$\psi(t) \le \exp\left\{C\exp\left\{C\int_0^t \psi^\alpha ds\right\}\right\}.$$

Standard arguments yield that for $M \triangleq e^{Ce}$ and $T_0 \triangleq \min\{T_1, (CM^\alpha)^{-1}\}$,

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}\psi(t) \le M,$$

which together with (3.17), (3.31), (3.46), and (3.50) gives (3.3). The proof of Proposition 3.1 is thus completed. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

With the a priori estimates in Section 3 at hand, it is a position to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let (ρ_0, u_0, H_0) be as in Theorem 1.1. Without loss of generality, we assume that the initial density ρ_0 satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\rho_0 dx = 1,$$

which implies that there exists a positive constant N_0 such that

$$\int_{B_{N_0}}\rho_0 dx \ge \frac{3}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\rho_0 dx = \frac{3}{4}. \tag{4.1}$$

We construct $\rho_0^R = \hat{\rho}_0^R + R^{-1}e^{-|x|^2}$, where $0 \le \hat{\rho}_0^R \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \int_{B_{N_0}} \hat{\rho}_0^R dx \ge 1/2, \\ \bar{x}^a \hat{\rho}_0^R \to \bar{x}^a \rho_0 \quad \text{in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ as } R \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Noting that $H_0 \bar{x}^{a/2} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\nabla H_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we choose $H_0^R \in \{w \in C_0^\infty(B_R) \mid \mathrm{div} w = 0\}$ satisfying

$$H_0^R \bar{x}^{a/2} \to H_0 \bar{x}^{a/2}, \quad \nabla H_0^R \to \nabla H_0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad \text{as } R \to \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $\nabla u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we select $v_i^R \in C_0^\infty(B_R)$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \|v_i^R - \partial_i u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

We consider the unique smooth solution u_0^R of the following elliptic problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\triangle u_0^R + \rho_0^R u_0^R + \nabla P_0^R = \sqrt{\rho_0^R} h^R - \partial_i v_i^R, & \text{in } B_R, \\ \mathrm{div} u_0^R = 0, & \text{in } B_R, \\ u_0^R = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_R, \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

where $h^R = (\sqrt{\rho_0} u_0) * j_{1/R}$ with j_δ being the standard mollifying kernel of width δ.

Extending u_0^R to $\mathbb{R}^2$ by defining 0 outside B_R and denoting it by $\tilde{u}_0^R$, we claim that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \left(\|\nabla(\tilde{u}_0^R - u_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} + \|\sqrt{\rho_0^R}\tilde{u}_0^R - \sqrt{\rho_0} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \right) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

In fact, it is easy to find that $\tilde{u}_0^R$ is also a solution of (4.5) in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Multiplying (4.5) by $\tilde{u}_0^R$ and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0^R |\tilde{u}_0^R|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_0^R|^2 dx \\ &\le \|\sqrt{\rho_0^R}\tilde{u}_0^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} \|h^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} + C\|v_i^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} \|\partial_i \tilde{u}_0^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla \tilde{u}_0^R\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_R} \rho_0^R |\tilde{u}_0^R|^2 dx + C\|h^R\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2 + C\|v_i^R\|_{L^2(B_R)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0^R |\tilde{u}_0^R|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_0^R|^2 dx \le C \tag{4.7}$$

for some C independent of R. This together with (4.2) yields that there exist a subsequence $R_j \to \infty$ and a function $\tilde{u}_0 \in \{\tilde{u}_0 \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) | \sqrt{\rho_0}\tilde{u}_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), \nabla \tilde{u}_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{\rho_0^{R_j}}\tilde{u}_0^{R_j} \rightharpoonup \sqrt{\rho_0}\tilde{u}_0 \text{ weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2), \\ \nabla \tilde{u}_0^{R_j} \rightharpoonup \nabla \tilde{u}_0 \text{ weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2). \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

Next, we will show

$$\tilde{u}_0 = u_0. \tag{4.9}$$

Indeed, multiplying (4.5) by a test function $\pi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\mathrm{div}\pi = 0$, it holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \partial_i(\tilde{u}_0^{R_j} - u_0) \cdot \partial_i \pi dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sqrt{\rho_0^{R_j}} (\sqrt{\rho_0^{R_j}}\tilde{u}_0^{R_j} - h^{R_j}) \cdot \pi dx = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $R_j \to \infty$, it follows from (4.2), (4.4), and (4.8) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \partial_i(\tilde{u}_0 - u_0) \cdot \partial_i \pi dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0(\tilde{u}_0 - u_0) \cdot \pi dx = 0, \tag{4.11}$$

which implies (4.9).

Furthermore, multiplying (4.5) by $\tilde{u}_0^{R_j}$ and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$, by the same arguments as (4.11), we have

$$\lim_{R_j\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(|\nabla \tilde{u}_0^{R_j}|^2 + \rho_0^{R_j}|\tilde{u}_0^{R_j}|^2\right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(|\nabla u_0|^2 + \rho_0|u_0|^2\right) dx,$$

which combined with (4.8) leads to

$$\lim_{R_j\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_0^{R_j}|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{u}_0|^2 dx, \ \lim_{R_j\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0^{R_j}|\tilde{u}_0^{R_j}|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \rho_0|\tilde{u}_0|^2 dx.$$

This, along with (4.9) and (4.8), gives (4.6).

Hence, by virtue of Lemma 2.1, the initial-boundary-value problem (1.1) and (2.2) with the initial data (ρ_0^R, u_0^R, H_0^R) has a classical solution (ρ^R, u^R, P^R, H^R) on $B_R \times [0, T_R]$. Moreover, Proposition 3.1 shows that there exists a T_0 independent of R such that (3.3) holds for (ρ^R, u^R, P^R, H^R).

For simplicity, in what follows, we denote

$$L^p = L^p(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad W^{k,p} = W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Extending (ρ^R, u^R, P^R, H^R) by zero on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R$ and denoting it by

$$\left(\tilde{\rho}^R \triangleq \varphi_R \rho^R, \tilde{u}^R, \tilde{P}^R, \tilde{H}^R\right)$$

with φ_R satisfying (3.8). First, (3.3) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t\le T_0} \left(\|\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^R}\tilde{u}^R\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \tilde{u}^R\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \tilde{H}^R\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{H}^R \bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\le \sup_{0\le t\le T_0} \left(\|\sqrt{\rho^R}u^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} + \|\nabla u^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} + \|\nabla H^R\|_{L^2(B_R)} + \|H^R \bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2(B_R)}\right) \\ &\le C, \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_0} \|\tilde{\rho}^R \bar{x}^a\|_{L^1\cap L^\infty} \le C. \tag{4.13}$$

Similarly, it follows from (3.3) that for $q > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0\le t\le T_0} t^{1/2} \left(\|\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^R}\tilde{u}_t^R\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{u}^R\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{H}^R\|_{L^2} + \|\tilde{H}_t^R\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &+ \int_0^{T_0} \left(\|\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^R}\tilde{u}_t^R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{u}^R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{H}_t^R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Delta \tilde{H}^R\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \tilde{H}^R \bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\right) dt \\ &+ \int_0^{T_0} \left(\|\nabla^2 \tilde{u}^R\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q} + t\|\nabla^2 \tilde{u}^R\|_{L^q}^2 + t\|\nabla \tilde{u}_t^R\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|\nabla \tilde{H}_t^R\|_{L^2}^2\right) dt \\ &\le C. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Next, for $p\in[2,q]$, we obtain from (3.3) and (3.58) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}\|\nabla(\tilde{\rho}^R\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^p}&\le C\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}\left(\|\nabla(\rho^R\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^p(B_R)}+R^{-1}\|\rho^R\bar{x}^a\|_{L^p(B_R)}\right)\\&\le C\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}\|\rho^R\bar{x}^a\|_{H^1(B_R)\cap W^{1,p}(B_R)}\le C,\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

which together with (3.59) and (3.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{T_0}\|\bar{x}\tilde{\rho}_t^R\|_{L^p}^2dt&\le C\int_0^{T_0}\|\bar{x}|u^R||\nabla\rho^R|\|_{L^p(B_R)}^2)dt\\&\le C\int_0^{T_0}\|\bar{x}^{1-a}u^R\|_{L^\infty(B_R)}^2\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho^R\|_{L^p(B_R)}^2dt\\&\le C.\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

By virtue of the same arguments as those of (3.46) and (3.50), one gets

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T_0}t^{1/2}\|\nabla\tilde{P}^R\|_{L^2}+\int_0^{T_0}\left(\|\nabla\tilde{P}^R\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\tilde{P}^R\|_{L^q}^{(1+q)/q}\right)dt\le C.\tag{4.17}$$

With the estimates (4.12)–(4.17) at hand, we find that the sequence $(\tilde{\rho}^R,\tilde{u}^R,\tilde{P}^R,\tilde{H}^R)$ converges, up to the extraction of subsequences, to some limit (ρ,u,P,H) in the obvious weak sense, that is, as $R\to\infty$, we have

$$\tilde{\rho}^R\bar{x}\to\rho\bar{x},\ \text{ in } C(\overline{B_N}\times[0,T_0]),\ \text{ for any } N>0,\tag{4.18}$$

$$\tilde{\rho}^R\bar{x}^a\rightharpoonup\rho\bar{x}^a,\ \text{ weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;H^1\cap W^{1,q}),\tag{4.19}$$

$$\tilde{H}^R\bar{x}^{a/2}\rightharpoonup H\bar{x}^{a/2},\ \text{ weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;L^2),\tag{4.20}$$

$$\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^R}\tilde{u}^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{\rho}u,\ \nabla\tilde{u}^R\rightharpoonup\nabla u,\ \nabla\tilde{H}^R\rightharpoonup\nabla H,\ \text{ weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;L^2),\tag{4.21}$$

$$\nabla^2\tilde{u}^R\rightharpoonup\nabla^2u,\ \nabla\tilde{P}^R\rightharpoonup\nabla P,\ \text{ weakly in } L^{\frac{q+1}{q}}(0,T_0;L^q)\cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^2\times(0,T_0)),\tag{4.22}$$

$$\tilde{H}_t^R\rightharpoonup H_t,\ \nabla\tilde{H}^R\bar{x}^{a/2}\rightharpoonup\nabla H\bar{x}^{a/2},\ \nabla^2\tilde{H}^R\rightharpoonup\nabla^2H,\ \text{ weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2\times(0,T_0)),\tag{4.23}$$

$$\sqrt{t}\nabla^2\tilde{u}^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\nabla^2u,\ \text{ weakly in } L^2(0,T_0;L^q),\ \text{ weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;L^2),\tag{4.24}$$

$$\sqrt{t}\sqrt{\tilde{\rho}^R}\tilde{u}_t^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\sqrt{\rho}u_t,\ \sqrt{t}\nabla\tilde{P}^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\nabla P,\ \text{ weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;L^2),\tag{4.25}$$

$$\sqrt{t}\tilde{H}_t^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}H_t,\ \sqrt{t}\Delta\tilde{H}^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\Delta H,\quad\text{weakly * in } L^\infty(0,T_0;L^2),\tag{4.26}$$

$$\sqrt{t}\nabla\tilde{u}_t^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\nabla u_t,\quad\sqrt{t}\nabla\tilde{H}_t^R\rightharpoonup\sqrt{t}\nabla H_t,\quad\text{weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2\times(0,T_0)),\tag{4.27}$$

with

$$\rho\bar{x}^a\in L^\infty(0,T_0;L^1),\qquad\inf_{0\le t\le T_0}\int_{B_{2N_0}}\rho(x,t)dx\ge\frac{1}{4}.\tag{4.28}$$

Then letting $R\to\infty$, standard arguments together with (4.18)–(4.28) show that (ρ,u,P,H) is a strong solution of (1.1)-(1.2) on $\mathbb{R}^2\times(0,T_0]$ satisfying (1.6) and (1.7). Indeed, the existence of a pressure P follows immediately from the $(1.1)_2$ and $(1.1)_4$ by a classical consideration. The proof of the existence part of Theorem 1.1 is finished.

It remains only to prove the uniqueness of the strong solutions satisfying (1.6) and (1.7). Let (ρ,u,P,H) and $(\bar{\rho},\bar{u},\bar{P},\bar{H})$ be two strong solutions satisfying (1.6) and (1.7) with the same initial data, and denote

$$\Theta\triangleq\rho-\bar{\rho},\ U\triangleq u-\bar{u},\ \Phi\triangleq H-\bar{H}.$$

First, subtracting the mass equation satisfied by (ρ, u, P, H) and $(\bar\rho, \bar u, \bar P, \bar H)$ gives

$$\Theta_t + \bar u \cdot \nabla \Theta + U \cdot \nabla \rho = 0. \tag{4.29}$$

Multiplying (4.29) by $2\Theta \bar x^{2r}$ for $r \in (1, \tilde a)$ with $\tilde a = \min\{2, a\}$, and integrating by parts yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int |\Theta \bar x^r|^2 dx \\
&\le C\|\bar u \bar x^{-1/2}\|_{L^\infty}\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}\|U\bar x^{-(\tilde a - r)}\|_{L^{2q/((q-2)(\tilde a - r))}}\|\bar x^{\tilde a}\nabla\rho\|_{L^{2q/(q-(q-2)(\tilde a - r))}} \\
&\le C\left(1 + \|\nabla \bar u\|_{W^{1,q}}\right)\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}\left(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

due to Sobolev's inequality, (1.7), (3.11), and (3.59). This combined with Gronwall's inequality shows that for all $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2} \le C\int_0^t \left(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} + \|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}\right) ds. \tag{4.30}$$

Next, subtracting the momentum and magnetic equations satisfied by (ρ, u, P, H) and $(\bar\rho, \bar u, \bar P, \bar H)$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho U_t + \rho u \cdot \nabla U - \mu \triangle U = & - \rho U \cdot \nabla \bar u - \Theta(\bar u_t + \bar u \cdot \nabla \bar u) - \nabla(P - \bar P) \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\nabla\left(|H|^2 - |\bar H|^2\right) + H \cdot \nabla \Phi + \Phi \cdot \nabla \bar H,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

and

$$\Phi_t - \nu \Delta \Phi = H \cdot \nabla U + \Phi \cdot \nabla \bar u - u \cdot \nabla \Phi - U \cdot \nabla \bar H. \tag{4.32}$$

Multiplying (4.31) and (4.32) by U and Φ, respectively, and adding the resulting equations together, we obtain after integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int \left(\rho|U|^2 + |\Phi|^2\right) dx + \int \left(\mu|\nabla U|^2 + \nu|\nabla\Phi|^2\right) dx \\
&\le C\|\nabla \bar u\|_{L^\infty}\int \left(\rho|U|^2 + |\Phi|^2\right) dx + C\int |\Theta||U|\left(|\bar u_t| + |\bar u||\nabla \bar u|\right) dx \\
&\quad - \int \Phi \cdot \nabla U \cdot \bar H dx - \int U \cdot \nabla \bar H \cdot \Phi dx \\
&\triangleq C\|\nabla \bar u\|_{L^\infty}\int \left(\rho|U|^2 + |\Phi|^2\right) dx + \sum_{i=1}^3 K_i.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

We first estimate K_1. Hölder's inequality combined with (1.7), (2.6), (3.3), and (4.30) yields that for $r \in (1, \tilde a)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &\le C\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}\|U\bar x^{-r/2}\|_{L^4}\left(\|\bar u_t \bar x^{-r/2}\|_{L^4} + \|\nabla \bar u\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar u \bar x^{-r/2}\|_{L^4}\right) \\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}\bar u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla \bar u\|_{L^\infty}^2\right)\|\Theta \bar x^r\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\quad + \varepsilon\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\left(1 + t\|\nabla \bar u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|\nabla^2 \bar u\|_{L^q}^2\right)\int_0^t \left(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2\right) ds \\
&\quad + \varepsilon\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

For the term K_2, we derive from Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and (3.41) that

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 \leq & C\|\bar{H}\|_{L^4}\|\Phi\|_{L^4}\|\nabla U\|_{L^2} \\ \leq & \varepsilon\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

The last term K_3 can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} K_3 \leq & C\|U\bar{x}^{-a}\|_{L^4}\||\nabla\bar{H}|^{1/2}\bar{x}^a\|_{L^4}\||\nabla\bar{H}|^{1/2}\|_{L^4}\|\Phi\|_{L^4} \\ \leq & C\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}\right)\|\nabla\bar{H}\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\Phi\|_{L^4} \\ \leq & \varepsilon\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2\right) + C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\bar{H}\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}\|\Phi\|_{L^4}^2 \\ \leq & \varepsilon\left(\|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \varepsilon\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\bar{H}\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2\|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.36}$$

owing to (1.7), (2.6), and (3.3).

Denoting

$$G(t) \triangleq \|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^t \left(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\sqrt{\rho}U\|_{L^2}^2\right) ds,$$

then substituting (4.34)–(4.36) into (4.33) and choosing ε suitably small lead to

$$G'(t) \leq C\left(1 + \|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla\bar{H}\bar{x}^{a/2}\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|\nabla\bar{u}_t\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2\right) G(t),$$

which together with Gronwall's inequality and (1.6) implies $G(t) = 0$. Hence, $U(x,t) = 0$ and $\Phi(x,t) = 0$ for almost everywhere $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$. Finally, one can deduce from (4.30) that $\Theta = 0$ for almost everywhere $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed. □

References

[1] H. Abidi and T. Hmidi, Résultats déxistence dans des espaces critiques pour le systéme de la MHD inhomogéne, Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal, **14**(2007), 103-148.

[2] H. Abidi and M. Paicu, Global existence for the MHD system in critical spaces, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, **138**(2008), 447-476.

[3] S. Agmon, A. Douglis and L. Nirenberg, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. I, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **12**(1959), 623–727; II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **17**(1964), 35–92.

[4] S. A. Antontesv and A. V. Kazhikov, Mathematical study of flows of nonhomogeneous fluids, Lecture notes, Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, U.S.S.R., 1973(in Russian).

[5] S. A. Antontesv, A. V. Kazhikov and V. N. Monakhov, Boundary value problems in mechanics of nonhomogeneous fluids, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

[6] Q. Chen, Z. Tan and Y. J. Wang, Strong solutions to the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., **34(1)**(2011), 94-107.

[7] Y. Cho, H. J. Choe and H. Kim, Unique solvability of the initial boundary value problems for compressible viscous fluids. J. Math. Pures Appl., **83** (2004), 243-275.

[8] H. J. Choe and H. Kim, Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for nonhomogeneous incompressible fluids , Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003), 1183–1201.

[9] B. Desjardins and C. Le Bris, Remarks on a nonhomogeneous model of magnetohydrodynamics, Differential Integral Equations, **11(3)**(1998), 377-394.

[10] E. Feireisl, Dynamics of viscous compressible fluids, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.

[11] J. F. Gerbeau and C. Le Bris, Existence of solution for a density-dependant magnetohydrodynamic equation, Adv. Differential Equations, **2(3)**(1997), 427-452.

[12] D. Hoff, Global solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data , J. Differential Equations, **120** (1995), 215–254.

[13] X. D. Huang and J. Li, Global well-posedness of classical solutions to the Cauchy problem of two-dimensional baratropic compressible Navier-Stokes system with vacuum and large initial data, http://arxiv.org/abs/1207.3746

[14] X. D. Huang and Y. Wang, Global strong solution to the 2D nonhomogeneous incompressible MHD system , J. Differential Equations, **254**(2014), 511-527.

[15] X. D. Huang and Y. Wang, Global strong solution with vacuum to the two-dimensional density-dependent Navier-Stokes system, SIAM J. Math. Appl., **46** (2014), 1771–1788.

[16] X. D. Huang and Y. Wang, Global strong solution of 3D inhomogeneous Navier-Stokes equations with density-dependent viscosity, J. Differential Equations, **259**(2015), 1606-1627.

[17] X. D. Huang, J. Li and Z. P. Xin, Global well-posedness of classical solutions with large oscillations and vacuum to the three-dimensional isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **65** (2012), 549–585.

[18] A. V. Kazhikov, Resolution of boundary value problems for nonhomogeneous viscous fluids, Dokl. Akad. Nauk., **216** (1974), 1008–1010.

[19] J. Li and Z. P. Xin, Some uniform estimates and blowup behavior of global strong solutions to the Stokes approximation equations for two-dimensional compressible flows, J. Differential Equations, **221**(2006), 275–308.

[20] J. Li and Z. L. Liang, On local classical solutions to the Cauchy problem of the two-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum, J. Math. Pures Appl., **102** (2014), 640–671.

[21] J. Li and Z. P. Xin, Global well-posedness and large time asymptotic behavior of classical solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum, http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.1673

[22] Z. L. Liang, Local strong solution and blow-up criterion for the 2D nonhomogeneous incompressible fluids, J. Differential Equations, **7**(2015), 2633-2654.

[23] P. L. Lions, Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics, Vol. I: incompressible models, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

[24] P. L. Lions, Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics, Vol. II: compressible models, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.

[25] B. Q. Lü and B. Huang, On strong solutions to the Cauchy problem of the two-dimensional compressible MHD equations with vacuum, Nonlinearity, **28** (2015), 509-530.

[26] B. Q. Lü, X. D. Shi and X. Y. Xu, Global well-posedness and large time asymptotic behavior of strong solutions to the compressible magnetohydrodynamic equations with vacuum, http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4851.

[27] L. Nirenberg, On elliptic partial differential equations. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa*, **13**(1959), 115–162.

[28] R. Temam, Navier-Stokes equations: theory and numerical analysis. Reprint of the 1984 edition, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2001.